

Application No. 10/032,979  
Amendment Dated: October 31, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of August 9, 2005

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

#### Status of the Claims

Claims 1–23 were pending and were rejected. Claims 1–23 have been cancelled, and new claims 24–35 have been added. Claims 24–35 are pending.

#### Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1–22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,411,605 to Vance et al. ("Vance"). Claim 23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Vance in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,784,561 to Bruno et al. ("Bruno"). Claims 1–23 are cancelled and this rejection is rendered moot.

#### New Claims 24–35

Each of claims 24–35 contain limitations not cited in Vance, Bruno, or the other cited art of record, and are therefore patentable. The following remarks are intended to aid in Examiner's understanding of the newly presented claims in light of the art previously cited. These remarks address only the independent claims (24 and 27). Because these independent claims are patentable over the cited art, claims depending therefrom are necessarily patentable.

Vance purports to disclose a scheduler for a telecommunications bridge. The scheduler authenticates a user based on a user database (*i.e.*, checks a password) and determines whether a conference may be scheduled based on the availability of a conference bridge. The scheduler then reports scheduling information to the user and other conference call participants. Bruno merely discloses a videoconferencing system that also includes some resource availability checks. Neither reference discloses any interaction with the electronic calendars of the conference participants.

Claim 23 is drawn to a network server including, *inter alia*, a resource scheduler configured to perform two or more of (i) interacting with calendars of others, (ii) sending conference invitations to others, and (iii) updating the calendars of others on acceptance of an invitation. Thus claim 23 requires some form of interaction with the calendars of the conference participants, either by interacting with the calendar (*e.g.*, checking availability of the

Application No. 10/032,979  
Amendment Dated: October 31, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of August 9, 2005

participants) or updating their calendar with the scheduled conference. Neither Vance nor Bruno teach or suggest this limitation.

Claim 27 is drawn to a method of scheduling a conference call including receiving a request to schedule a call, determining whether the call can be completed based on one or more network policies and the availability of the conference participants, as determined from their calendars. As noted above, neither Vance nor Bruno, either separately or in combination, teach or suggest such a method.

In view of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 23-35 are in condition for allowance and requests that a notice of allowance issue for these claims.

\*\*\*\*\*

Respectfully submitted,

  
Billy C. Allen III, Reg. No. 46,147

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Wong, Cabello, Lutsch,  
Rutherford & Brucculeri, L.L.P.  
20333 State Hwy 249, Suite 600  
Houston, TX 77070  
832/446-2409

**CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION**

**37 C.F.R. § 1.8**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office at 571/273-8300 on the date below.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Rebecca R. Ginn